

1 M. Steven Wang SBN 191168
2 City Attorney
3 Sari Myers Dierking SBN 226805
4 Asst. City Attorney
5 **City Attorney's Office**
6 **CITY OF FOLSOM**
7 50 Natoma Street
8 Folsom, CA 95630
9 TEL: 916.461.6025; FAX: 916.351.0536

10 **P O R T E R | S C O T T**
11 A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
12 John R. Whitefleet, SBN 213301
13 2180 Harvard Street, 500
14 Sacramento, California 95815
15 jwhitefleet@porterscott.com
16 TEL: (916) 929-1481, FAX: (916) 927-3706

17 Attorneys for Defendants CITY OF FOLSOM, JOSEPH HOWARD, BRIAN LOCKHART,
18 ROMAN KEHM, ZACHARY WELLS, JOHN WAGNER, BRANDON MONSOOR, PAUL
19 RICE, DEREK KOUPAL, MICHAEL AUSTIN, JOSHUA SENA, EATHAN VAVACK, JOHN
20 MONIZ

21 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
22 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

23 GEORGE P. UMBERGER II, LISABETH A.
24 KING, SAVANNAH R. BAILEY,

25 v.
26 Plaintiffs,

27 CITY OF FOLSOM, DETECTIVE JOSEPH
28 HOWARD, COMMANDER BRIAN
LOCKHART, SERGEANT ROMAN
KEHM, SERGEANT ZACHARY WELLS,
SERGEANT JOHN WAGNER,
SERGEANT BRANDON MONSOOR,
SERGEANT PAUL RICE, CORPORAL
DEREK KOUPAL, OFFICER MICHAEL
AUSTIN, OFFICER JOSHUA SENA,
OFFICER EATHAN VAVACK, AND
OFFICER JOHN MONIZ,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:24-cv-010169-KJM-JDP

**DEFENDANTS' NOTICE OF
MOTION AND MOTION TO
DISMISS PLAINTIFF'S
COMPLAINT**

Date: October 9th, 2025
Time: 10:00 AM
Courtroom: 9, 13th Floor (via Zoom)

Complaint Filed: 04/22/2024

27
28 ///

1 NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on the above date and time and in the above Courtroom
 2 of the United States District Court, Eastern District of California located at 501 I Street, Sacramento,
 3 California, Defendants CITY OF FOLSOM, JOSEPH HOWARD, BRIAN LOCKHART, ROMAN
 4 KEHM, ZACHARY WELLS, JOHN WAGNER, BRANDON MONSOOR, PAUL RICE, DEREK
 5 KOUPAL, MICHAEL AUSTIN, JOSHUA SENA, EATHAN VAVACK, JOHN MONIZ hereby
 6 move the Court for an order dismissing the Complaint of Plaintiffs, pursuant to Federal Rules of
 7 Civil Procedure (“Fed. R. Civ. P.”) 12(b)(6) on the following grounds:

- 8 1. Plaintiffs’ judicial deception claim for violation of the Fourth Amendment (first claim for
 9 relief) fails as a matter of law, as to both search warrants at issue, because the claimed
 10 omissions/misrepresentations are either not material or do not effect the finding of probable
 11 cause; in addition, there are insufficient allegations against Defendant Wagner in said claim;
- 12 2. Plaintiffs’ claim for forced entry for violation of the Fourth Amendment (first claim for
 13 relief) fails because the allegations reveal sufficient exigency; in addition, there are
 14 insufficient allegations against Defendant Howard in said claim;
- 15 3. Any claim arising from detention itself of Plaintiffs during the execution fails;
- 16 4. Plaintiffs’ failure to intervene claim against Defendants Monsoor, Vavack, Rice and Moniz
 17 fails to state sufficient facts specific to each individual;
- 18 5. The fifth claim for Excessive Handcuffing against all defendants fails for lack of specificity
 19 against each defendant;
- 20 6. All Official Capacity Suits are Redundant to the Claims Against the CITY and should be
 21 dismissed;
- 22 7. The first, second, third, fourth and fifth claims for relief fail to state sufficient facts of a
 23 Monell-type claim against the City.
- 24 8. Plaintiffs’ Seventh claim for Failure to Supervise, Hire, Train and Discipline against the City
 25 for a Monell-type claim fails.
- 26 9. Plaintiffs’ Eight claim against the City for a Monell-type claim fails.

27 ///

28 ///

1 Dated: August 11, 2025

2 PORTER SCOTT
3 A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

4 By /s/ John R. Whitefleet
5 John R. Whitefleet
6 Attorney for Defendants

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28